REMARKS

Claims 14-18 and 26-39 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of September 7, 2006, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 39 depends from a cancelled claim.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 39 has been amended to depend from claim 38.

Art Rejections

Claims 26-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knebel et al., U.S.C. 5,198,001 in view of Huling, WO 99/58239.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 26 and 27 have been amended to recite that the gas containing contaminants is passed though a single sorbent. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification as filed at page 27, line 21 through page 28, line 15. This passage in the specification makes it clear that a single sorbent is required, as it is noted that mixed wastes can be sorbed to activated carbon and reacted with hydroxyl ion according to the Fenton reaction to oxidize the compounds *in situ*. A ground water plume or contaminated air containing a mixture of contaminants such as halogenated volatiles, polycylic aromatic hydrocarbons, and fuel compounds can be treated together.

In responding to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner noted that Knebel discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited iron amended sorbent and the specific oxidant material employed. However, it should be noted that Knebel discloses that the gas stream is passed through at least two beds of adsorbents, each having a different physical or chemical makeup (column 2, lines 24-27). In Knebel, the VOC's are typically segregated in the adsorber, with the heaviest compounds concentrated in the top and lightest components in the bottom (column 2, lines 57). That is, Knebel requires different sorbents for different contaminants, and each contaminant or group of contaminants is separately adsorbed, and then released from the adsorber for combustion. At column 3, lines 5-29, Knebel describes how the disclosed system is capable of accommodating various adsorbents. That is, the different adsorbents can be segregated using inert materials, by support screens, etc. It is clear that Knebel contemplates using a variety of adsorbents for a variety of compounds. There is nothing in Knebel that suggests adsorbing all of the contaminants on a single sorbent for *in situ* oxidation of the contaminants. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art, reading Knebel, would not be motivated to use the single adsorbent disclosed in Huling and claimed herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: ______________________
Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\E\epb\Huling1c\pto\2006-12-07 AMD.doc